

A Charter of Human Security

REVEREND FREDERIC SIEDENBURG, S.J.

Reprinted from the Catholic World, (New York) February, 1933.

THE wealth of the world is fundamentally static; it was created by no man and obviously was meant for the good of the race, for it is still true "that the Earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof."

The Creator gave men intellects, a moral sense and a social instinct so that they might be impelled to distribute all wealth for the benefit of all. From the dawn of creation, however, the selfishness of human nature has been the great obstacle of economic justice. From the earliest pages of recorded history we read of "man's inhumanity to man," manifesting itself most of all in greed of wealth and selfishness of power over other men. From the beginning, too, there has been opposition to this inhumanity, manifested in murders and revolts, in migrations and secessions of whole peoples, and especially in that curse we call war. A finer opposition has been found in appeals to justice and humanity especially when motivated by morals and religion. Thus the Jews sanctified the fiftieth year, when debts were cancelled; thus the early Christians, in fear of greed, adopted a communistic life; thus the medieval Church puts its ban on interest and called it usury.

When we survey the material resources of the world, we find that under their development by man, there is potentially plenty of food and raiment and shelter for the race. As the population grows, so do the methods of production, and today the Malthusian theory has only an historical significance. But food, shelter and clothing are but the bare essentials of human security. Man is a rational animal, and he must be at peace with himself and his neighbor; he must in some measure know the true, sense the beautiful, and love the good. In our civilization this means that the normal man must be employed, for he has "a right to work," which must be provided by the state if all other means fail; moreover, he has a right to a wage adequate to the current standard of living for himself and a family. He

has a right to recreation and those intangible spiritual entities that make life human and worth while. All these rights are those of a person, which makes them sacred and gives them a priority over every other right. Here we have the content of the charter of human security. Here we have a picture of "frugal comfort" which Leo XIII said was a minimum standard of living.

When the twentieth century was ushered in, our prophets of mind and matter assured the world that with the supremacy of machinery nature was conquered and that food and shelter and raiment were for everyone who would take the trouble to ask for them. They assured us that the machine gave leisure for study, which would lead to human emancipation, knell the doom of authority in government and the supernatural in religion and that men at last would be free in soul and body. They assured us that the progress of the world excluded the possibility of another war and their breath was hardly cold, when 1914 inaugurated the most monstrous war that the world has ever known, a war which shook the very foundations of economic and political security. Though the armistice was signed in 1918, the war has continued as an economic one for Europe and the Orient and for the last three years it has shaken the United States of America to its roots.

Human economic security has rarely been fully realized, but it is a goal that should be held in view. For a hundred years or more, such security in the United States has been conditioned in factory and on farm by our machine technique. Machinery has brought blessings to mankind, but today it is Frankenstein's monster destroying human security. A group of engineers at Columbia University have under the name of "Technocracy" studied the mechanization of industry and the perils of over production. They claim that "within thirty years we have multiplied the original or human engine by nearly nine million as expressed in a modern transversion unit."

In the last ten years, the efficiency of machinery has advanced more than in all recorded history. The effect of this on employment is clear; a United States government report shows that while the quantity of manufactured goods from 1919 to 1929 rose 58.5% there was a marked decrease in the number of factory workers. The 16.5% growth of

population during these ten years increased this disparity. Here are a few concrete illustrations: 40,000 bricks can be produced per man per hour. Until quite recently hand-made bricks were produced at the rate of 450 per day. One Corning machine produces 442 electric bulbs per minute, which 30 years ago would have required 10,000 men. This explains in part why we have thirteen million men out of work and why poverty and distress infest the land.

Senator Couzens of Michigan recently declared, "Jobless men are not free men since they have no alternative but to accept such wages as may be offered and this permits the few to exploit the many." President Hoover, for a time, contended that it is not for the federal government to provide for the unemployed and that it is the duty of the community and private charity to come to their relief. If this is true, the fundamental principle of democracy is at an end and we have ceased to be a government "of, for, and by the people." Perhaps the good machine is not to be blamed, it may rather be our bad ethics, and after all, perhaps we should accept our machine age, control and humanize it until it produces comforts and not concerns for all our people. We must make the machine the servant and not the master of men.

But there is another serious menace to human security. It has been computed at the present time that 149 men in this country have incomes running into millions a year, and of this number, three combined capitalists, can, if they will, control our money market. This accumulation of wealth in the hands of a few gives the dangerous power to obstruct the circulation of the nation's money and to destroy the balance between production and purchasing power. We must find ways and means to remedy this menace and make more equitable the distribution of our wealth. It is better to reform with law and order than to have it done for us in chaos and revolt.

In the concrete, the mechanization of industry and agriculture and the concentration of wealth have given wider opportunities for jeopardizing human security; and, since zeal for profits by individuals outruns control by government, it is inevitable that the capitalistic system, irrespective of its merits, should give occasion and opportunity for supreme selfishness. In its career of economic violence it

was at times checked by superior personalities and groups; at other times by public opinion and the consolidation of labor and eventually more forcibly by government through anti-trust laws, public utility commissions, industrial legislation, workingmen's compensation and other laws. Weighed down by the World War and its aftermath, our capitalistically inspired country found these controls feeble and inadequate and as a consequence the masses of our people find themselves today practically bankrupt.

We have only time to consider the economic collapse of our own United States and its relations to human security. The essential cause is again the *laissez-faire* principle of unlimited competition, with its consequent unjust distribution of wealth. The net result is the same unemployment and poverty. Because of the low purchasing power of our masses, we call the unlimited competition "over-production," a dishonest euphemism for under-consumption. With an excess of goods, we close down industry and we depreciate agriculture, because with unemployment, there follows decline of business, fall of prices, bank failures, and logically the collapse of our whole credit system. Newton Baker, as chairman of the welfare and relief mobilization for 1932, recently said: "Probably a quarter of our people are without income and are dependent for the barest living upon relatives, friends, and community unemployment funds."

Ex-Governor Roosevelt's "forgotten man" of the recent campaign was no myth. He was not solitary but legion in every walk of life, among the chronic poor and paupers; among those who for the first time, humbly begged for alms, and among those who had known opulence and who never dreamed the day would dawn on which they would reckon with the morrow. The forgotten man is here and we will remember him a long time. With Edwin Markham, the author of "The Man With the Hoe," we may say:

"Not on our golden fortunes builded high—
Not on our boasts that soar unto the sky—
Not upon these is resting in this hour
The fate of the future: but upon the power
Of him who is forgotten—yes, on him
Rest all our hopes, reaching from rim to rim."

This is the plight of depression in which we stand at the present time; in a nation that four years ago seriously discussed the permanent passing of poverty so that a rival political party did not hesitate to jibe "a chicken in every pot and two cars in every garage"! Our major political parties attack the symptoms but are afraid to confront the real causes. Instead of advocating fundamental reconstruction, these parties, to the horror of their *laissez-faire* advocates, will soon have the government in every business—from banking to baking; from "Fermented Fruits Corporation" to "Farm Products Cooperatives"—first owning and then operating them, as the Socialists might well desire.

A recent economist has said, "We have but three alternatives—Chaos, Socialism, or Capitalism reorganized." For my part, I dislike chaos, historically it has little to commend it; I am not impressed with Socialism, especially the variety now on display in the Russias, and in spite of all its faults, I prefer Capitalism when purified, socialized, and sublimated. I believe it is not hopeless as a system, and that it is best adapted to the American character and its "rugged individualism," to borrow a phrase from Mr. Hoover. We have no peasant class that might tolerate mass regimentation and even our children insist on their sovereign individuality. The function of our government should be to curb and control, not to own and operate, because the substitution of professional politicians for business men is a remedy worse than the disease we wish to cure, and at the same time, it will deprive us of the very protection against exploitation that we demand of government. Our government has repeatedly interfered by law, in the interest of the common good, but we were not equipped for the social and economic upheaval with which we have been deluged and our federal subsidy, strange to say, has gone rather to financial corporations than to individual citizens; rather to gigantic industries than to oppressed homes.

Our economic system was originally built on the theory of a scarcity of productions, when now we need an economics of abundance. It is no longer true that the harder a man works the more he does for himself and society; and the idea that everybody has a chance to get rich at the expense of society must give way to a democratic idealism which makes the common good the test of action. We need

not accept the revolution of chaos or communism, and exchange the subtle financial tyranny of America for the violent ruffian tyranny of Russia. We need not accept capitalistic Fascism, which, with more social control, might give us less human misery, but would rob us of our inborn initiative and give us intolerable regimentation. We need not destroy our present order, we may modify it and make it radical in the sense that it would go to the ethical roots of property rights, and demonstrate that they are secondary and subsequent to sacred and inalienable human rights.

We must socialize our processes of production and distribution, not by revolution, but by evolution, that is, by education, propaganda, and legislation. The more obvious steps have been taken, others are already known and are even advocated in our national platforms. There can be no argument against a living wage law that assures our highly exalted American standard of living. There can be no argument against workingmen's compensation acts, because the persistent deaths and injuries to the individual are essential to the industry and should be charged to the cost of production, and hence, to the ultimate consumer. There can be no argument against mothers' aid laws and old age pension legislation, for they are more intelligent and more human and less expensive methods of administering accepted public charities. But these are not enough; we are facing new conditions and new remedies are demanded. The times demand unemployment insurance, minimum wage legislation, health insurance, old age pensions, a Federal Employment Bureau, shorter labor weeks and days, restrictions on women and child labor and others. A word about each of these:

Unemployment has long been a permanent malady. It will become increasingly so due to displacement by machinery and the non-employment of older men. Unemployment insurance is a stumbling block to many a capitalistic mind; and yet it is neither more nor less than applying to the wages of the worker the principle of money reserves, so familiar to the United States Steel Corporation, and the New York Central Railroad Company. The United States Steel Corporation and others put aside sinking funds of hundreds of millions of dollars from prosperity profits, not only to cut their income taxes, but to pay dividends in

times of depression. Why may not the workers with the cooperation of the State and industry lay aside a portion of wages in good times, to be used in the inevitable unemployment that is to come?

The United States Department of Labor announced recently that during 1930 and 1931, while the cost of living decreased 18%, employment decreased 33%, and wages 54%. Here is the depression epitomized! Social legislation will at least prevent this periodical recurrence of cycles of starvation in the midst of plenty. We must do something to correct the ruinous equation of mass production without mass consumption, which always equals mass unemployment.

The justice of minimum wage laws is based on the assumption that there is a human standard of living that no industry or employer may violate, because when less than a human wage is tolerated, the industry becomes a parasite and the State eventually pays the inhuman differential in public alms or service. Recently the United States Supreme Court has nullified the minimum wage law for women in the District of Columbia and thereby nullified similar laws in fourteen states. This decision was a five to four decision, like many others that have thrown into the discard, laws protecting the poor and the under-privileged. Is it not time that the will of Congress, which after all, is the direct will of the people, be not put at naught, by the vote of a solitary judge of even our august Supreme Court?

The case of health insurance still is unpopular, and alas, savors of Socialism, but in view of the proven value of private health as a public asset, the exacting sanitary demands of industry, the menace to the community of ill health, it is but just and right that the state should share the cost of health with citizens who cannot bear the cost alone.

There can be no argument against a Federal Employment Bureau, which at any moment knows how to bring the man in New York and the job in Ohio together. Such a bureau would likewise do away with the inefficiency and duplication of local and state bureaus and the cruel exploitation of the jobless, practiced by private agencies.

Old age pensions are today an absolute necessity, because modern industry is rejecting the man and woman over

forty, thus obliging the state in common decency to build old folks' homes all over the land. A less costly, and a more self-respecting solution is that of old age pensions by the state. Ten or more states find this a satisfactory solution of a difficult problem.

The mechanization of industry makes imperative shorter periods of labor, because even with the return to normalcy and under the most favorable conditions, many laborers will go back at lower wages and five million men will be unable to find any employment if we keep our eight hour standard. It is a simple problem of mathematics, of spreading the opportunity among the greatest number, but it cannot be done without state and federal mandates.

The fewer women and children employed, the more men will find places. Men are the natural bread-winners, whereas women and children have only too often social and physical handicaps that impede the general progress. We must revive the battle for the Child Labor Amendment, and restrict to definite fields of work women, and especially married women.

Here are the articles of our charter of human security, and to be effective, they must be guaranteed by the law. But in a country like ours, they will not be on our statute books unless citizens of social vision put them there. Every social law in force today had to struggle against powerful opposition, but the victory was worth the fight. The most hopeful sign we have is that in the recent elections the protest of the people was against special privileges of the few and an appeal for an opportunity for the masses. There was a demand for "a new deal," which will manifest itself in social betterment of the underprivileged, and let us hope that it will not stop until these demands are written into the laws of the land.

When all this shall have been done, the millennium will not as yet have arrived. Our universe is too complex for such a simple solution, but we will have made a beginning and be better attuned to meet the more fundamental and profounder problems of finance and of state. Never before were the nations of the world physically and morally so close together, and soon, in our own interest, we must make ourselves articulate in the councils of the League of Nations and in the revision of the Covenant of the League. We can-

not be indifferent to disarmament and the Kellogg Pact; we cannot be indifferent to international economic conferences and the revision of tariffs. After 1919 we were not only the bankers, but the manufacturers of the world, and this economic contradiction both Newton Baker and Owen D. Young call "the basic calamity underlying the depression." Its entanglements still remain and await solution.

Then there is the question of the nationalization of our banks, the inflation or deflation of credit, the gold standard and all that is involved in the lower costs of living and the higher rates of taxes. And there is the progressive control of natural resources and utilities, extravagances of government, and last but not least, the fate of the Eighteenth Amendment of the Constitution and all that it implies.

The proper solution of these problems will pave the road to the New Jerusalem, for a sounder and juster nation with more opportunities, and more wealth for the common man. But what is here most important, is that we approach the solution of these problems in the spirit of the laws of our human charter; the spirit of a sane internationalism that goes beyond the borders of state and nation, and guarantees to the least nation and the humblest human being honest treatment; the spirit of a genuine nationalism that founds its laws on the decalogue and its practice on the Constitution of the country. The square deal is the soul of our charter of human security, a charter that makes more of principles than of patriotism, values men more than money, and gives a security beyond that of the senses, a security of mind that realizes that the kingdom of God is within every man. If we reject this charter, the forces of disorder and distress may wreak their wrath and our last state shall be worse than our first.

No matter how we change our political policies and our economic theories, it will not be enough, unless we reckon with the spiritual cravings of men, for it is eternally true that "man lives not by bread alone." We must see in every man a brother whose weal or woe is reflected in the lives of all. For the immediate present, we must satisfy the cravings of the body, and if need be, the government must pour out billions for relief and for government work. But woe to us if we neglect the things of the spirit—the nation's soul; if we do, no one can predict the outcome.

Popular Education During the Middle Ages

HUGH GRAHAM, PH.D.

Reprinted from Thought (America Press, New York), June, 1933.

THE history of medieval education is a rich field for research, but one which is still largely unexplored. This neglect of a great age is unfortunate for many reasons. One consequence, among others, is that popular textbooks in educational history continue to repeat traditional errors and misstatements whenever they venture to refer to the status of education during medieval times. To safeguard immature students against such sources of misinformation there is urgent need of a generous supply of scientific studies covering various phases of medieval culture. It is especially necessary to warn against an uncritical acceptance of distorted views inspired by those twin enemies of medievalism: the enthusiasm of the devotees of the classical Renaissance, and the bias of the protagonists of the Protestant Revolt.

I

Perhaps no phase of the remarkable educational development which may be traced during the millenium which preceded the fifteenth century has received such scant courtesy as that which has to do with the efforts of the medieval Church to extend the benefits of education to the various ranks of European society, even to those who were lowest in the social scale. In this connection it is worth noting that as recently as 1914 the late Arthur F. Leach complained that there was no adequate history of English education.¹ It may be added that the reputation of Mr. Leach as a scholar rests mainly on the fact that for more than thirty years he labored successfully to lay the foundations for such a history. He disposed forever "of the current and common view that English schools and any education in England worthy of the name dated from the Reformation."² Experience shows, however, that the uprooting of

¹A. F. Leach, "Some Aspects of Research in the History of Education in England." (London, 1914), p. 2.

²*Ibid.*, pp. 3-4.

historical errors is a slow process. For instance, a recent book³ intended for American college students contains a selection from Green, the English historian, which gives the impression that education in England received a great impetus from the Protestant Reformation, and more especially from the Puritan element which, it is claimed, popularized the reading of the Bible in the English tongue. No hint is given that the writings of all noteworthy English authors from the days of Caedmon to those of Chaucer show familiarity with the Bible, nor that the Bible in the vernacular was in the hands of orthodox Catholics prior to the great religious and political revolt of the sixteenth century.⁴

Perhaps no book has done more to mislead American readers than Payne's translation of a work by Compayré which contains the following startling statement:⁵

With La Salle and the foundation of the Institute of the Brethren of the Christian schools, the historian recognizes the Catholic origin of primary instruction; in the decrees of the French Revolution, its lay and philosophical origin: but it is to the Reformers—to Luther in the sixteenth and to Comenius in the seventeenth—that must be ascribed the honor of having first organized schools for the people. In its origin the primary school is the child of Protestantism, and its cradle is the Reformation.⁶

The statement just quoted has misled many readers who have had no opportunity to consult source material. Several writers have accepted the unsupported testimony of Compayré, regardless of the fact that modern scholarship has shown that the claims made for Luther and Comenius are simply preposterous. Indeed, it can be shown that both before and after the Reformation many forces contributed to the development and extension of popular education, and that the Reformation played a minor, if not a negative, role. A study of Luther's writings reveals no high ideal of the function of the elementary school. He says:⁷

My idea is not to create schools like those we have had. . . . A boy should pass one or two hours a day at school and let him have the rest of his time for learning a trade in his father's house. . . . So also girls should have an hour a day at school.

³Cubberley, E. P., "Readings in the History of Education" (Boston, 1920), p. 261.

⁴See F. A. Gasquet, "The Eve of the Reformation" (New York, 1900), Ch. VIII.

⁵Gabriel Compayré, "The History of Pedagogy" (Payne's translation, Boston, 1897), p. 112.

⁶The italics are the writer's.

⁷Martin Luther, "Schrift an die Rathsherren," 1524.

As a matter of fact Luther was concerned mainly about secondary education.⁸ Equally baseless is the claim, so often advanced, that Luther was a pioneer advocate of compulsory attendance. In this regard he was anticipated by King Alfred the Great about 893 A. D.⁹ Moreover, it is a matter of record that as early as 1496 a compulsory-attendance law was actually passed by the Scottish Parliament at a time when Scotland was still an integral part of Catholic Christendom. This, the first compulsory-attendance law enacted by any European government, required barons and freeholders to send their sons and heirs to school from the age of eight or nine years until they should be "competently founded and have perfect Latin."¹⁰ The law assumes the existence of schools which, as Grant bears witness, were planted in every considerable town in Scotland at this time.¹¹

As for the educational services of Comenius, to which Compayré and others have attached so much importance, there is clearly a large element of exaggeration. A modern non-Catholic scholar while admitting the Comenius was one of several propagandists of new educational ideas, says:¹²

Unfortunately his *Great Didactic* in which he set forth his general principles, attracted little attention and won less adherence, although his school books in which he attempted with very little success to apply his principles were widely used in schools. But they were little more than bald summaries of real or supposed facts, stated in Latin and the vernacular in parallel columns. In content they differed from such medieval summaries of knowledge as the well-known works of Bartolomew Angelicus, which had been widely used since the thirteenth century, chiefly in greater baldness and aridity of treatment.

Even the idea of the popular *Janua linguarum reserrata* of Comenius was borrowed from a work with a similar title by the Irish Jesuit, William Bathe, whose work preceded by twenty years that of Comenius. From the account that the latter gives of the "*elegans inventio Linguarum Januae Hibernica*," as he describes Bathe's work, we learn that trans-

⁸Albert Stoeckl, "Lehrbuch der Geschichte der Paedagogik," p. 211.

⁹See Preface to King Alfred's translation of the "Pastoral Care of Pope Gregory the Great."

¹⁰See J. E. G. DeMontemorency, "State Intervention in English Education" (Cambridge, 1902), p. 112, for text of this law.

¹¹James Grant, "The History of the Burgh and Parish Schools of Scotland," p. 25.

¹²Cloudsley Brereton, article "Education" in the "Encyclopedia Britannica."

lations of the learned Jesuit's book had already been made into English, French, and German from the original Latin-Spanish edition.¹³

II

Recent investigations of the educational history of England, Germany, and other countries have effectively disposed of the myth as to the Protestant origin of the elementary school,¹⁴ as well as of the introduction of vernacular Bible by the Reformers.¹⁵ Many scholars of liberal views, however, hesitate to claim a pre-Reformation origin for the elementary school, now regarded as the people's school par excellence, as its variant titles, the "common school," and *Volksschule*, suggest. The issue to some extent rests on a definition of terms. There is a tendency to limit the term *elementary school* to one which was concerned with "pre-adolescent, native vernacular education"¹⁶ "attended by common folk who did not aspire to a professional career,"¹⁷ and aimed at supplying "a type of education which was relatively complete."¹⁸

This conception of elementary education is decidedly arbitrary. It fails to include those present-day educational systems which make provision for bilingualism on the elementary-school level and it neglects to take account of recent developments which are breaking down the artificial divisions between primary and secondary education; but, above all, it does violence to the facts of history which clearly indicate marked educational development due to religious, political, economic, and social factors. It intentionally excludes any school in which even the rudiments of Latin were taught and it fails to account for the fact that vernacular education was not uncommon, a fact which is especially emphasized by the demand for printed books

¹³T. Corcoran, S.J., "Studies in the History of Classical Teaching," p. 76. Corcoran devotes 130 pages to an illuminating discussion of Bathe and his method of teaching.

¹⁴A. F. Leach, op. cit., and "English Schools at the Reformation (London, 1897); E. Allain, "L'Instruction primaire en France avant la Revolution" (Paris, 1881); J. Janssen, "History of the German People at the Close of the Middle Ages," Vol. I, 15th ed. (London, 1905); H. Graham, "Education in Medieval Scotland," *Catholic Educational Review*, May, 1929.

¹⁵F. A. Gasquet, op. cit.; J. Janssen, op. cit., Vol. I, Bk. I, Ch. II.

¹⁶S. C. Parker, "The History of Modern Elementary Education" (1912), p. 3.

¹⁷E. H. Reisner, "The Evolution of the Common School" (1930), p. 3.

¹⁸J. W. Adamson, "A Short History of Education" (Cambridge, 1922), p. 73.

in the vernacular from the middle of the fifteenth century onwards in various countries, notably Germany, England, and France.¹⁹

The rise of the vernaculars, however, did not displace Latin in the schools for the simple reason that for the laity as well as for the clergy it was the most valuable of subjects.²⁰ Hence, prior to the sixteenth century, and much later, no school worthy of the name would have thought of excluding the study of Latin from the curriculum. For instance, in the vernacular schools which were established in the commercial cities of Germany from the thirteenth century onwards, Latin as well as *Deutsch* was considered necessary.²¹

From the preceding discussion two important conclusions emerge: first, that the origin of popular education cannot be attributed to the Reformation; and second, that a conception of the people's school that would restrict it virtually to vernacular and secular education in the three R's is lacking in historical perspective. Such an ideal of education was utterly foreign to the medieval mind which regarded another R, religion, as the very heart of the curriculum.

III

A major problem which invites our attention involves a consideration of the different medieval institutions which were mainly responsible for the popularization of education. It is hardly necessary to say that Christianity was not heir to any ready-made system of schools. The Church was not concerned with culture for its own sake, but as a means to advancing her own sublime mission among men irrespective of race or station in life. Although she has had at all times illustrious scholars within her ranks her ultimate objective was not the creation of an aristocracy of learning. She made her first appeal to the common people. As Christianity spread to all classes throughout the Roman Empire, Christian schools gradually displaced and superseded pagan in-

¹⁹See J. W. Adamson, *op. cit.*, Ch. V; J. Janssen, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, Bk. I, Ch. I; Brother Azarias, "The Primary School in the Middle Ages" in *Essays Educational* (New York, 1896); Willmann-Kirsch, "The Science of Education," Vol. I, Ch. XVIII.

²⁰See A. F. Leach, "Some Results of Research in the History of Education in England," pp. 31-32.

²¹Elbert Vaughan Wills, "Elementary Education in the German Cities up to the Sixteenth Century," *Education*, Vol. I, No. 4 (December, 1929).

stitutions of learning. It is worth remembering, however, that the grammar or secondary schools retained their pagan character longest and that Christian elementary and higher schools developed much earlier.²² With rise in the West of episcopal and monastic schools, Christians no longer had occasion to resort to the schools of the pagan grammarians and rhetoricians. Indeed, much of the educational history of Western Europe prior to the rise of the universities in the twelfth century might be written on the contributions of these two major educational agencies of the Medieval Church.²³

Volumes might be written about the monastic schools alone. From the fifth century onward they spread all over Western Europe.

The mere number of the monasteries—in 1500 there were no less than 37,000 monasteries belonging to the Benedictines and to branches of their Order—is sufficient evidence of the important public function of the religious orders; and if we grant that only one twentieth of these 37,000 monasteries had regular schools, they would still constitute no small part of the school system of the time.²⁴

The estimate is conservative so far as the existence of schools is concerned; for it may be safely assumed that every monastery which admitted novices made provision for their education. Such was the function of the "inner school." For our purpose, however, it is important to emphasize the fact that the laity were not excluded from the educational facilities which the monasteries afforded. The "outer school" was expressly for those who did not aspire to take monastic vows. Many instances might be cited to establish the fact that boys were often admitted to monasteries, and girls to convents in order that members of both sexes might be given an opportunity to acquire religious and profane learning during their tender years. Afterwards they were free to take their places in the world according to their social station.²⁵

Every cathedral town had a grammar school which was open to lay pupils as well as to candidates for the priest-

²²Theodore Haarhoff, "The Schools of Gaul" (Oxford, 1920), p. 175; Willmann-Kirsch, "The Science of Education," Vol. I, p. 191.

²³Cf. L. Maitre, "Les écoles épiscopales et monastiques en occident" (Paris, 1924); H. Graham, "The Early Irish Monastic Schools" (Dublin, 1923).

²⁴Willmann-Kirsch, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 199-200.

²⁵Bede, "Hist. Eccl. Gentis Anglorum," Plummer's ed., Vol. I, p. 192; L. Maitre, op cit., Ch. V and VI; H. Graham, op cit., p. 192.

hood. It was presided over by a learned priest, styled the *scholasticus*. As representative of the bishop he was titular head of all teaching in the diocese and was in charge of the licensing of teachers.

In its internal organization the cathedral school paralleled the contemporary monastic school. It had its lower and higher divisions, the *schola minor* and the *schola maior*. In the former, sometimes called the song school, reading, writing, singing of hymns and Psalms, and the comput were taught. In the higher division, the preparatory disciplines—the trivium and the quadrivium—were taught as well as theology and other studies necessary for the priesthood. With the rise of the universities the more advanced studies were transferred to the latter. Side by side with the cathedral schools there arose other grammar schools which were associated with collegiate churches administered by a college of canons.²⁶ Both Riboulet²⁷ and Krieg²⁸ have pointed out the significance of these schools as a means of promoting popular education and Leach's study gives substantial grounds for believing that both the cathedral and collegiate churches had grammar schools and song schools as an integral part of their foundations. In England before the Dissolution in 1548 there were more than 200 such establishments scattered about the county²⁹

providing secondary education in the grammar schools, as well as elementary education in the song schools for all and sundry and not merely for choristers . . . to an extent far greater than was provided in post-Reformation England until the end of the seventeenth century.

IV

The educational facilities of the Middle Ages were not limited to any one social class. They were available to the children of the peasant as well as to the children of the king, but not in the same proportion. The palace schools of the Merovingian and Carolingian periods had their counterparts in the court schools established by Alfred the Great and other monarchs.³⁰ In the castles of the feudal nobility the

26C. Krieg, "Lehrbuch der Paedagogie" (Paderborn, 1900), p. 95.

27L. Riboulet, "Histoire de la pédagogie" (Paris, 1925), p. 126.

28C. Krieg, *op cit.*, p. 94.

29A. F. Leach, "Some Results of Research in the History of Education in England," p. 20.

30Cf. J. B. Mullinger, "The Schools of Charles the Great"; C. Plummer, "Life and Times of Alfred the Great" (Oxford, 1902), pp. 135-160.

education of chivalry required a long and careful training which provided for the needs of a small but important social class. It represented a type of training that was especially necessary for the man of action, the ruler, the soldier, and the courtier.³¹ In the later Middle Ages many English youths were prepared for important official positions in the king's palace, in the households of the bishops, and in the Inns of Court.³²

A school of quite a different type was the *charity school* which catered to the needs of those at the other end of the social scale. Such schools existed at least from the third century when the Church confided to deacons and deaconesses the care of orphans. During the following centuries the hospital, the almonry, and the hospice were established not solely for the care of travelers, the sick, the incurable, and the old, but also for the refuge and asylum of deserted infants. The Rules and Constitutions of several Religious Orders imposed the obligation of rearing poor and abandoned children and dispensing to them both spiritual and material food.³³

The schools mentioned served the needs of special classes, but the school which did most to provide for the children of the masses was the *parish school*. Its origin is obscure. Presbyteral schools were in existence in Syria in the second century, but we are unable to assign a definite date to the rise of the parish school in the West. It probably existed from the earliest times when parishes were organized. The first definite indication we have of its establishment in the West would appear to be that which is contained in an ordinance of an ecclesiastical council held in Italy in 443 A. D. which required priests to instruct the youth of the neighborhood in their presbyteries.³⁴ In the following century the Council of Vaison (in the south of Gaul) commended this custom already practised in Italy, and ordered priests to establish schools in which young scholars might learn to read the Psalms and pursue the study of the Holy Scriptures, become familiar with the law of God and be worthy successors in the ministry of the

³¹J. W. Adamson, op. cit., Ch. III.

³²T. F. Tout, "An Advanced History of Great Britain" (London, 1910), p. 242.

³³L. Riboulet, op. cit., pp. 125-126.

³⁴L. Riboulet, op. cit., p. 123.

Gospel.³⁵ During the same year (529) the Synods of Orange and Valence, also in southern Gaul, decreed that similar schools were to be erected in all villages and towns.³⁶

V

A study of ecclesiastical legislation from the sixth century onwards reveals a clearly defined policy which was decidedly favorable to the expansion of popular education. The stamp of the official approval was placed on what in many instances was becoming a widespread practice. Both particular and general councils of the Church, imperial capitularies, and episcopal and Papal decrees show that while bishops and Popes were primarily concerned with making provision for instructing the future members of the clerical body in the sacred sciences they were also at pains to encourage and promote the education of the laity.³⁷ The following are specific instances of educational legislation which had a far-reaching influence on the development and extension of popular education during the Middle Ages: the councils of Tours (567), Toledo (624); Constantinople (681); Bavarian pastoral instructions (774); council of Cloveshoe, England (749); the capitularies of Charlemagne (787, 789); the synods of Aachen (789, 817); councils of Chalons (813), Paris (829), Rome (853); the edict of Emperor Lothair (825); the canons of King Edgar (960); Lanfranc's constitutions (1075); synod of Westminster (1133); Lateran councils (1179, 1215). The list³⁸ is not exhaustive but is significant of the extent and persistency of the official policy of the Church in diffusing the benefits of education throughout the length and breadth of Christendom. M. Allain, who has surveyed the greater part of the studies of medieval schools, declares that anyone who would form an adequate idea of the intellectual status of our ancestors in past ages must have recourse to these ecclesiastical documents, the collections of the Church councils.³⁹

At least three inferences of major import may be made from an examination of these decrees. The first is that edu-

³⁵F. Ozanam, "La Civilization chrétienne chez les Francs" (Paris, 1893), pp. 473-474.

³⁶Krieg, op. cit., p. 97; Willmann-Kirsch, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 191-192.

³⁷W. Turner, Art. "Schools," *Catholic Encyclopedia*.

³⁸Cf. Mansi, "Concilia"; "Monumenta Germaniae Prædagogica"; Leach, "Educational Charters"; Ozanam, op. cit., Ch. IX.

³⁹"L'instruction primaire en France avant la Revolution," Ch. II.

cation was definitely brought under the canon law. The second is that the Church displayed commendable zeal in bringing the means of education within reach of all classes irrespective of geographical location. The third is that the decrees and ordinances were no mere empty gestures, but were intended to be put into effect.

Researches conducted in different dioceses of France leave no doubt as to the wide diffusion of elementary education in that country, at least during the later Middle Ages.⁴⁰ The same is true of the various regions of Germany which have been studied in detail. Especially noteworthy is the development of municipal and burgher schools which were established to meet the needs of a new social class between the peasants and nobles.⁴¹ In like manner the economic prosperity of the towns of the Low Countries provided conditions favorable to the great educational renaissance which drew its stimulation and support from the Brethren of the Common Life during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.⁴²

VI

When we turn from the Continent to Britain we find that popular education was making steady progress. The author of "Piers Plowman," writing in the last decade of the fourteenth century, rather illiberally complains that the children of the poor made their way to high estate through the school doors.⁴³ Again about a hundred years later the rapidity with which printed books were bought is good evidence of the existence of a reading public. In England the printer confined himself almost exclusively to the vernacular,⁴⁴ while the first book ever printed in Scotland was one which contained poems of Dunbar and Chaucer, tales of romance and old ballads.⁴⁵ The famous Paston Letters (1422-1509) supply additional objective evidence that literacy, so far from being the monopoly of the clergy or of the privileged classes, was widespread among men and women of various social ranks.⁴⁶ The question as to the means

⁴⁰Cf. Brother Azarias, op. cit., pp. 172-180.

⁴¹E. V. Wills, loc. cit., pp. 197-211.

⁴²Albert Hyma, "The Christian Renaissance" (New York, 1924), pp. 122-135, pp. 339-349.

⁴³J. W. Adamson, op. cit., p. 76; "Piers Plowman," C. VI, ll. 70ff. (Skeat's Ed.).

⁴⁴Ibid., p. 81.

⁴⁵H. Graham, "Education in Medieval Scotland," *Catholic Educational Review*, May, 1929, p. 273.

⁴⁶J. W. Adamson, op. cit., pp. 82-83.

whereby this literacy was acquired turns our attention to the schools which were existing in England towards the end of the medieval period. Leach enumerates seven classes of schools—schools connected (1) with cathedrals, (2) with monasteries, (3) with collegiate churches and colleges, (4) with hospitals, (5) with guilds, (6) and with chantries, as well as (7) independent schools, existing ostensibly and actually by themselves as independent entities.⁴⁷ Leach thinks that 300 is a moderate estimate of such schools in the year 1535 "when the flood-gates of the great revolution which is called the Reformation, were let loose, most of them were swept away either by Henry VIII or his son; or if not swept away, plundered and damaged."⁴⁸

Other writers have also noted that the onslaught which the Reformers made on the Catholic doctrine of "good works" resulted in drying up a rich source of educational endowment as in the case of the chantries just cited. Speaking of the effect of the Reformation in Germany Paulsen says:⁴⁹ "The first effect of these events on educational institutions was destructive; the old schools and universities were so bound up with the Church in all respects—socially, legally, economically—that they could not but be involved in its downfall."

VII

No one will deny that in modern times considerable progress has been made in the popularization of education, but we must not overlook the fact that the medieval Church almost without any assistance from the State did much to provide for the educational needs of the masses. We should also remember that the Middle Ages did not confuse education with mere schooling and that many phases of medieval life were decidedly educational in character. It is true that the Middle Ages had their dark shadows but they had also lights of varying degrees of brilliancy.

47A. F. Leach, "English Schools at the Reformation," Part I, p. 7.

48A. F. Leach, *ibid.*, Part I, p. 6.

49F. Paulsen, "German Education" (New York, 1908), p. 64.